

DETAILED COMMENTS

Comments on the Summary Section of the Draft EIS:

- The boxes had a design life of 20 years, but have been used for storage for 28 years. Has the condition of the boxes been investigated to determine corrosion or decomposition? If not, why not?
- DOE has been storing waste since the 1970's not 80's.
- How can 95% of the 65,000 cubic meters be classified as mixed waste when 10% of the volume is classified as "to be determined" and 24% as metal debris?
- The description of supercompaction should discuss the weight limits on truck drums.
- Incineration controls should indicate key parameters (e.g. mercury levels).
- Why would the maximum increment of carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic air pollutants be projected to occur at the INEEL boundary rather than at the proposed facility?
- In the opening paragraph on page S-11, the term "criteria" should be defined.

Comments on other sections of the Draft EIS:

- Reduce the non-specific (generic) information presented in Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13 and the related sections in Chapter 5.
- The last paragraph on page 4.4-1 should be explicit as to "sites" at the location of the proposed facility.
- "Earthquake ground motion" is defined on page 4.5-3 as "acceleration *due to* gravity," which is incorrect. It is ground motion measured in terms of the constant $g=32\text{ft/sec}^2$, which is the acceleration due to gravity.
- Is it accurate that the natural background dose for Snake River Plain residents is 360 millirem per year (stated on page 4.7-3) when 200 millirem is attributable to inhalation of radon decay particles? This doesn't seem consistent with a statement on page 4.9-5 that indicates 90% of radioactivity found in the vegetation at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex is attributable to Strontium-90 or Cesium-137.
- None of the historical data on page 4.12-2 are related to the expected impacts of the AMWTP.